

## **Dillon Resource Management Plan ID Team Meeting**

**October 30, 2001**

**Attendees:** Renee Johnson, Scott Powers, Rich Maggio, Jim Roscoe, Rick Waldrup, John Simons, Joe Casey, Mark Sant, Steve Armiger, Huey Long, Jeff Daugherty, Brian Hockett, Wendy Favinger, Joan Trent, John Bown, Laurie Haas, Rob Van Deren, Lynn Anderson, Andrea Wiggins

The Dillon Resource Management Plan (RMP) Interdisciplinary (ID) Team meeting began with a welcome to the group and introductions.

Scott Powers expressed his expectations for the group and talked about the opportunity the RMP presented to the group in helping shape management of public lands and resources in the Dillon Field Office. Some of the goals outlined to the group were as follows:

- Move forward and make accomplishments related to what we're here for
- Let the negative things roll off and stay focused on the task at hand
- Make the plan as readable and understandable as we can
- Reach collective agreement on at least some decisions to be made in the plan

The Dillon RMP is a new generation RMP that will play an important role in the management of public lands in Montana. A lot of people will be watching what we are doing. We have some latitude on what the plan will look like, although the Washington Office (WO) is working to provide guidance on how the plan should look given the number of new plans that are being started Bureauwide.

### **Agenda**

Renee Johnson went through the agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday.

### **Update on the Montana Consensus Council Project**

Renee gave an update on work the BLM has done with the Montana Consensus Council (MCC) regarding the RMP. MCC conducted a situation assessment earlier this spring asking the public how they would like to be involved during development of the Dillon Resource Management Plan. As a result of this assessment, a group of people interested in providing suggestions regarding public involvement strategies during the course of plan development has been formed by the MCC, called a coordinating committee. This is not a working group which advises BLM on substantive issues; it is a group that discusses public involvement strategies with the MCC and BLM. So far, the Coordinating Committee has discussed how best to provide feedback to the public on the comments received as a result of Scoping, and a forum or "Information Fair" to disseminate some of the base information that the BLM intends to use in the RMP. The situation assessment indicated that the public wants to know what kind of information we're using to go through this planning process.

### **Phoenix Session Highlights**

Renee presented highlights from a BLM planning meeting held in Phoenix the week of October 15th regarding time sensitive plans. While the Dillon RMP is not on the official time sensitive list, our schedule is the same as the time sensitive plans. All the state office planning leads who had time sensitive plans, WO personnel, and several Associate State Directors attended the meeting. Twenty three plans are being started now Bureauwide, with more to come in out years.

The WO believes that we need to have some consistency in the format and objectives of land use plans. The WO also wants consistency in how we're dealing with the national energy policy, the national vegetation EIS, threatened and endangered (T&E) species conservation strategies, and the national fire management plan. The need for consistency is being addressed due to the anticipated high levels of interest from the Department of the Interior and the public. There will be a consultation team from WO visit all State Offices with planning starts and discuss the consultation process on all the new and upcoming plans.

Several draft instruction memos were reviewed in Phoenix. The WO is looking at providing some guidance on standard table of contents, web sites, and GIS map servers, etc. Due to our schedule we are going to have to remain flexible, but still move forward.

A national planning support team will be formed at the WO. The purpose of the team is to assist time sensitive plans in getting through the planning process in a timely manner. There will be a WO level review of the plan to ensure consistency with policy, and the Department of Interior is very interested in being informed on all BLM plans. Therefore, it is critical that each member of the team network with your state lead on the programs/resources assigned to you to ensure we are on track with State and WO approaches and directives.

The 1610 planning dollars are short based on the Bureauwide FY 2002 preplan budget requests. Much of this is related to requests for funding for new data collection. The WO believes that many of the requests for additional funding for data work is actually related to implementation work instead of RMP work. In addition, 1610 planning dollars have never been used to fully fund plans in the past. WO requested all preplans be reviewed and adjustments made in light of some suggested cuts. WO also suggested that benefitting subactivities may need to fund portions of plan preparation. Dillon prepared a tentative adjustment of workmonth spreads to staff which would require other subactivity funding to stay on schedule. We will look at RMP schedule adjustments if necessary after the budget is clearer and the WO review timeframes are better established.

Another point of discussion was implementation of a three tier communication type plan for time sensitive plans. Under this plan, the WO and State Office would interact with national level and state level organizations. The WO also requested State Offices not to release new guidance regarding planning at this time. There was also much discussion and concern expressed over Interior review of Federal Register notices. Dillon is lucky to have gotten our NOI published.

A reminder to everyone to remain flexible as things happen, especially in regard to new direction from WO as we proceed. We're trying to select the writer-editor position and we'll hopefully have that person on by December. That person will assist in writing and will give the staff guidance on how to submit information, and a variety of other duties.

### **Memorandum of Understanding with Beaverhead County**

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed on October 29 with the Beaverhead County Commissioners identifying Beaverhead County as a cooperating agency. Rob Van Deren will work with the BLM on behalf of the County. The MOU specifies areas in which the county can provide us help or special expertise. These include social, economic, road, noxious weed, access, and travel management issues.

### **December Training "Successful Land Use Planning"**

Renee sent a message to everyone about enrolling in the Successful Land Use Planning course. The course will be held at the Sheraton Billings on December 10-14. This course is

the basis “nuts and bolts” for Bureau planning and will discuss the different steps of the planning process. Some people may have to be dropped off the list since the training is open to all employees throughout the Montana/Dakotas and there is a limit of 36 spaces. However, Dillon will have some preference as will Lewistown since they’re starting a land use plan. The people considered most critical for the training are Rick Waldrup, Scott Powers, Renee Johnson, Joe Casey, John Simons, Jim Roscoe, Steve Armiger, and Lynn Anderson. The people considered least critical for the training are Mark Sant, Brian Hockett, Rich Maggio, and Mark Goeden.

### **RAC Involvement**

The Resource Advisory Council (RAC) is the sanctioned advisory group to the BLM. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act discusses utilizing established advisory councils when doing land use planning, and the planning regulations require an advisory council be informed and their views sought and considered throughout the RMP process.

Eight new members on the fifteen member Resource Advisory Council (RAC) have just been approved by the Department. The RAC’s first meeting with all new members is tentatively sometime in mid-January, and a major agenda item will be the Dillon RMP. The RAC is made up of the three following categories: Category 1 - Commodity/Land User, Category 2 - Conservation/Environmental, and Category 3 - General Official/Public-at-Large/State Employees. As such, it represents a diverse array of interests.

One of the agenda items for the next RAC meeting will be to discuss what kind of role they want to take in development of the RMP. We are hopeful they may want to be involved with a hands-on approach for some particular aspects of the plan through use of subgroups. This would be modeled after the process the RAC used to be involved in the Whitetail-Pipestone Travel Management Planning effort. If so, and the RAC wanted to structure it this way, the Montana Consensus Council could provide facilitator assistance to the subgroups as they worked on their assignment. BLM would provide a person to serve on any subgroup if the RAC desired that. This person’s primary involvement with the RAC group would be to provide information and address sideboards.

The ID team will be asked for ideas later in the meeting regarding issues or elements of the plan that the RAC may be able to provide some assistance to BLM. We need to think about what we can realistically ask the RAC to do.

The RAC members for each of the three categories are as follows:

<b>Category 1</b>	<b>Category 2</b>	<b>Category 3</b>
Rob McCulloch - Butte <i>Minerals</i>	Katie Deuel - Missoula <i>Conservation</i>	C. Ted Coffman - Virginia City <i>Elected Official</i>
Sue Marxer - Dillon <i>Permittee</i>	Bruce Farling - Missoula <i>Conservation</i>	Gary Williams <i>State Govt</i>
Douglas Abelin - Helena <i>Off-Road Vehicle Use</i>	Susan Lenard <i>Environmental</i>	Pat Flowers <i>State Govt</i>
Roger Peters - Dillon <i>Permittee</i>	Ben Deeble <i>Environmental</i>	Mel Montgomery - Lima <i>Public-At-Large</i>
Donna Tate McDonald <i>Commercial Recreation</i>	Richard Young <i>Environmental</i>	Robin Cunningham <i>Public-At-Large</i>

## **General Scoping Impressions**

To date, we have received 188 responses from the 1,000 individuals and groups we mailed scoping brochures to. Of those 188, 108 only wanted to stay on the list and 80 had comments also. We don't know who 11 of those people are, since they tore off the mailing label from their response. We indicated that people had to respond back to us to stay on the list. However, we'll add people to the mailing list at any time during the planning process. People who were on the list and didn't respond back to us will go off the list, but they can be put back on the list anytime they want.

We had approximately 50 people come to the five open house style meetings to get more information. The meetings were held in Lima, Sheridan, Dillon, Ennis, and Butte.

We mailed a special letter to federal and state agencies, offering to come and meet with them to see how they might want to cooperate with this plan. This letter went to the Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation, US Fish and Wildlife Service, EPA, NPS, Red Rocks Refuge, Ennis Fish Hatchery, Sheep Experiment Station, Governor's Office, FWP, DEQ, DNRC, MDOT, and four tribal governments. We received response from about half of these agencies ranging from just staying on the list, only wanting to receive a draft plan to extensive comment (ie a 45 page scoping letter from EPA). We will follow up with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), since different people from the DEQ are responding to us. The head person from DEQ said he didn't want to be involved with the planning process, but some of the staff said they did want to be involved.

We will do a content analysis on all of the comments received. Joan Trent will help with this. We will make copies of the comment documents available. Only one person requested to have information withheld according to the privacy act.

## **Preliminary Issue Review**

Renee briefly highlighted some of the types of scoping comments being received, and identified some areas where she felt the general issue categories needed to be adjusted. She asked the team to provide some thoughts about the structure of the issues as presented.

The following are preliminary issues identified in the scoping brochure and at the open houses:

- Vegetation Management
- Watershed Management
- Special Area Designations
- Special Status Species
- Access to Public Lands/Travel Management
- Commercial Uses
- Land Tenure Adjustments

Several people commented that some of these issues were too general. After some discussion, it was suggested the team brainstorm issues. The brainstorm list is as follows:

habitat fragmentation  
S&G's  
weed control  
biological or connective corridors between  
ecosystems  
reference areas

implementing T&E species conservation  
strategies and agreements  
populations viability of native plants and  
animals  
forest health  
riparian function

- upland function
- public access
- livestock forage
- open space
- recreation by different types
- water quality
- 303 D list
- aquatic habitats
- mineral entry
- oil and gas stipulations
- water quantity
- abandoned mine lands management
- sagebrush management
- hazardous fuels management
- visual resource management
- travel management
- river management
- T&E Species
- conventional forestry
- ACEC
- WSA/wilderness
- mineral development
- opportunities for economic activity
- landscapes of significant ecological interest
- urban growth/sprawl
- quality of life
- traditional custom and culture
- public health & safety
- effects to different groups
- restrictions to energy development
- compatibility of commercial uses vs. resource protection

- government expenditures
- land ownership pattern
- effects to adjacent landowners
- conflicts between commercial and non-commercial use
  - \*motorized/non-motorized
- river designations
- species designations
  - \*indicator
  - \*key
  - \*special status
  - \*keystone
- education of the public
- right of way corridors
- avoidance areas for ROWs
- soil productivity
- erosion
- national designations
- national trails
- soil survey
- urban/wildland interface
- law enforcement on public lands
- appropriate levels of facility development for recreation
- maintenance of existing facilities/signs
- management workload in fire years
- Snowmobiles
- invasive non-native species (non-noxious - i.e., cheatgrass, Kentucky Bluegrass, Timothy, Smooth Brome, Sweetclover, etc.)
- Definition of ecological thresholds (as they relate to “desired future conditions”)

We need to finalize what primary issues will drive development of the RMP and then summarize these issues to provide feedback to the public and brief to the State Director.

It was agreed that once the Content Analysis of public comment is completed, that the core team would meet and identify issues common to both the ID team and the public. This review would also look at how to structure the feedback to the public to keep it concise and simple. Primary issues will then be finalized and issue summaries prepared to be released to the public. Members of the ID Team may be asked to prepare and/or review the issue summaries.

### **Suggestions from IDT on RAC Involvement**

The team was asked to consider the list of issues identified in the previous exercise and suggest where they might find RAC involvement helpful. There was concern expressed about how the RAC would be involved and whether they had enough knowledge to be involved. It was also discussed that the RAC represents a diverse groups of interests and that it would be very helpful to the BLM and the ID team if they could assist on certain elements of the plan. The team came up with the following suggestions:

For each suggestion, ask RAC:

- Does the RAC want to work with this issue/element of the plan?
- Give the flexibility on how they want to be involved (or not)
- What level of involvement does the RAC want?  
(specific recommendations, establish guidelines, develop alternative, review only, provide implementation guidance)
- How will information be provided to the BLM?

Travel Management

- \*Develop implementation strategy once decisions made in plan
- \*Provide advice on levels and/or kinds of “restrictions”  
(ie. general designation of open versus designation by type of use)
- \*Provide advice on what access needs are in this area
- \*Assist BLM in coordination with other agencies

Ask RAC to provide some guidelines on Sagebrush Management  
(there was a comment that this issue is too complex for the RAC to tackle)

Ask RAC to provide guidance on how to approach allocation of outfitted hunting use

Ask RAC about an Open-Closed-Limited approach for the entire plan

Ask RAC to consider doing the following things for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

- \*Provide education to public
- \*Review evaluation of nominated ACECs
- \*Make recommendations about ACECs carried forward into alternatives

Ask RAC to provide recommendations or review on desired future conditions.

Have RAC focus on concerns brought forward by public on particular issues and make recommendations to BLM on how to approach/address.

Ask RAC to provide guidance to BLM on how to provide for “balanced” use

October 31, 2001

### **Summary from Tuesday's Meeting**

Renee will work with Joan on getting the content analysis done and will then provide this information to the ID Team. The core team will meet to compare the content analysis information against the brainstorm charts and identify common themes/issues. The team will then determine what the primary issue statements should be for the RMP, and assignments may be made for team members to write summaries of certain issues to be used for feedback to the public, for the RAC meeting in January, and as the basis for briefing the State Director on planning issues. Once we've finalized issues, we will determine if there are any additional issues or elements of the plan we may want to ask the RAC for assistance on.

We will send a short notice out to the public sometime this month (November) after we have updated the mailing list to let folks know where we are in process. After the content analysis is completed and we've adjusted the issues and planning criteria based on the comment, we will then release another update to the public discussing how their comments influenced the issues and planning criteria and discussing the adjustments that were made.

### **Discussion of Proposed Planning Criteria**

Renee gave an overview of planning criteria and some of the scoping comments. Planning criteria are proposed to help guide the development of the plan, avoid unnecessary data collection and analyses, and to ensure the plan is tailored to the issues. Proposed criteria were provided to the public during scoping to help them understand the scope of the plan and some of the sideboards we will be considering during plan development.

A lot of the public comments were related to the planning criteria. Many public comments received stated that wilderness study areas (WSA's) should go away. We don't have the latitude to "unrecommend" WSA identified under section 603 of FLPMA. Other comments suggested we shouldn't do a wild and scenic river review. Our planning guidance says that we will look at wild and scenic river management during our land use planning process. Deferring this review leaves us open at the end of the planning process for people to request us to do an amendment.

A comment was made that we should revisit travel management in the Centennial Valley during the RMP. We feel this decision made is valid and recent enough that we don't need to revisit travel management in that area.

The team was asked to review a handout of the proposed planning criteria (used during scoping) to determine what clarification or changes, deletions or additions they might recommend.

The ID Team discussed the following proposed planning criteria:

**Bullet #4** - Regarding wilderness. Rick Waldrup provided clarification of direction regarding wilderness inventory. We must respond to new information provided during the planning process, but do not have an obligation to do a blanket reinventory all of the public lands in the Field Office that have been previously reviewed. We will be looking at lands we have recently acquired that haven't been included in a review.

**Bullet #3** - There was a question on the wording of the criteria describing the planning area and whether that would affect the ability to map watersheds, landscapes, etc. The criteria is

meant to specify that decisions in the RMP will only be made on public lands administered by the BLM, not on other agency or private lands. This will be clarified by adding the word “decisions” after RMP

A suggestion was made to add the following to the criteria: “The BLM will utilize information gathered in the Gravelly’s and Pioneer Landscape Analyses.” There weren’t any decisions that came out of this landscape analysis, just recommendations.

**Bullet #1 (back page)** - There was discussion in relation to the planning criteria related to adoption of Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing as to how much more specific the RMP would be, especially regarding “numerical values”. The RMP will provide goals and objectives for management of resources, and guidance to direct BLM’s management. It has been suggested it would be helpful to provide guidance to the specialists on how they should go about monitoring to determine whether we’re meeting S&G’s when those assessments are being done. However, the plan should be less prescriptive and more goal oriented, and provide some flexibility for change through time.

The following changes will be made to the proposed planning criteria:

- The word “decisions” will be added after RMP to clarify the bullet regarding the planning area.
- The area along the Big Hole River that is under the jurisdiction of the Butte Field Office will be described better by adding “from Divide to Wisdom” in the bullet regarding the planning area
- A statement will be added about incorporating information from the Gravelly and Pioneers landscape analysis

The team decided to wait and see what comes out of the content analysis to determine whether more adjustments should be made to the proposed planning criteria..

### **Wild & Scenic River Update and Assignments**

Renee provided the ID Team with some background information regarding the Wild and Scenic River process to folks new to the team or not involved with the study.

BLM asked for nominations during scoping on any streams to be considered under our Wild and Scenic River review. We received some limited suggestions on streams we should make sure to consider. Many people responded they did not want any Wild and Scenic Rivers in this area.

Lynn Anderson has been leading the initial review so that we can complete the eligibility assessment of streams—the first step in the review process. She has compiled the information she’s been provided and has a draft with information gaps from some specialists. Assignments were made for all writeups to be to Lynn by November 9<sup>th</sup>. A meeting date to review the draft and have final discussions regarding eligibility was scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup> at 8 am. Our goal is to coordinate with the Forest Service and then release a draft eligibility report to the public for comment after the first of the year, hopefully January or February 2002.

### **Management Situation Analysis Discussion and Assignments**

An outline identifying the eight sections in the Management Situation Analysis (MSA) outline was handed out and discussed. This was sent to specialists earlier this summer, along with some lengthier explanatory information. The MSA is the baseline document for developing the



RMP. It provides baseline information that goes into the existing environment and for alternative development. This particular outline was put together by some people Alaska with consultation from John Thompson in the State Office. Specialists are going to have to make a decision about how much information is going to be in the resource section.

The outline and guidance information for the MSA will be put on the shared directory for everyone to access.

A second outline showing organization by resource or program was then handed out. This outline was developed from looking at the Oil and Gas EIS and other RMPs and attempting to take the best of their structures. This is just a way to organize information. It may be this will be adjusted if we get some additional guidance from WO on how they want the plan to look.

The team discussed this and the following changes were made:

- Have a separate category for species of special concern, with subcategories of wildlife, fisheries, and plants.
- Make riparian/wetlands a separate category.
- Under the water category, delete impaired streams and wetlands and add water quality, water quantity, and municipal watersheds.

January 25 was set as the deadline for specialists to have write-ups done on sections 2, 4, 6, and 7 of the MSA. Then we will proceed with other sections to be assigned at the next meeting. A handout on Document and Editing Protocols was also handed out for the specialists' to use when preparing/writing their sections.

The following table provides some guidance to the specialists when doing the write-ups for a particular section:

Section Number	Comments
II.	Each program needs to determine what the laws, regulations, and policies are.
III.	Some of this information could be in the Gravelly and Pioneers Landscape Analysis.
IV.	The evaluation table in the MFP may help in doing this section.
V.	A. - Some of this information will be in the Gravelly and Pioneers Landscape Analysis.
VI.	This section will provide an opportunity to talk with other people about their plans and what they're doing regarding management (other state, federal, and local agencies).
VII.	Some examples of this would be cultural resources with Native American values or levels of restrictions on public lands.
IV.	This information could be described in a table. Providing descriptions by each objective might be a good way to write these up.

## **Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Discussion**

During scoping we provided information to the public on the current nominations that will be evaluated, and we also requested nominations for other ACECs. We received many nominations/suggestions from the public. We asked them to provide boundaries and maps, and to tell us why they felt this nomination met the importance and relevance criteria at that time. Sometimes good information was provided, and other times, it was not. We will compile a list of all the ACEC nominations and set up files for each nomination. Team members were asked to copy any MFP information they find in relation to previously nominated ACECs and put them in ACEC folders that will be developed. Mark Goeden also has quite a bit of information compiled on the MFP nominations.

We will try to schedule an initial ACEC review in January. A question was asked about the appropriate time to bring forth “internal” nominations. The MSA is the place to identify if there are resources of “substantial significance” that need special management. The process to evaluate nominated ACECs is very similar to the two-tiered Wild and Scenic River review process.

## **GIS Data Review**

One of the comments we have consistently heard from the start of the RMP is concern and interest in what data we’ll use to develop the plan. To provide an opportunity for the public to review our data, we have plans to hold an Information Fair. At this time, we anticipate this will be an open house event for three days in this office from the afternoon into the evening. GIS mapping information will be available for the public to view, and we would be open to suggestions about other data sets that exist, etc. At this point, it appears February will be the earliest this will happen.

Assignments were made on a week-by-week basis to work with Laurie Haas on compiling and finalizing GIS coverages. Laurie passed out a sheet indicating coverages assigned by specialist.

<b><u>Week</u></b>	<b><u>Specialist(s)</u></b>
November 5	David Kampwerth, Mark Sant, Mike Warren
November 12	Same as above
November 19	Rick Waldrup–Road and Trail Inventory
November 26	Jim Roscoe
December 3	Lynn Anderson and Rick Waldrup
December 10	Planning Training in Billings
December 17	Lands, especially withdrawal info
December 24	Laurie’s catch-up
December 31	Mark Sant
January 7	Brian Hockett, Huey Long
January 14	Bob Gunderson
January 21	Joe Casey
January 28	Open

There is a requirement that any geospatial data used in the RMP be accompanied by FGDC compliant metadata. The following web site contains examples of FGDC compliant metadata: <http://www.blm.gov/nhp/what/geospatial/clearinghouse/htm>

Specialists need to provide a summary of the source of their data, how they created their data, how they’ve been updating their data, and what the data reflects. Renee will try to provide a bulleted worksheet for specialists to use for their notations and provide to Laurie.

**Closeout**

The core team will start meeting every two weeks, Tuesdays at 1 p.m., starting with November 20<sup>th</sup> at 1 p.m. The core team consists of Joe Casey, John Simons, Jim Roscoe, Rick Waldrup, and Mark Sant.

The next ID Team meeting will be January 29-30, 2002, at the Dillon Field Office, beginning at 1:00.

Agenda items for the next ID Team meeting are:

- Share final issues and planning criteria
- Update on RAC involvement
- Share MSA information to date
- Make remaining MSA assignments with deadlines
- Discuss ACEC approach/make assignments
- Make final GIS assignments
- Discuss Information Fair